



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,712	03/30/2001	Gregor Sagner	5443	7485

41504 7590 07/13/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
2 EMBARCADERO CENTER, 8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

CHUNDURU, SURYAPRABHA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/823,712	Applicant(s) SAGNER ET AL.	
	Examiner Suryaprabha Chunduru	Art Unit 1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17, 23-26 and 31-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17, 23-26 and 31-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' response to the office action filed on May 5, 2005 has been entered.

Status

2. Claims 15-17, 23-26, 31-41 are pending. Claim 31 is amended. Applicants' response to the office action is fully considered and found persuasive. All arguments have been fully considered and thoroughly reviewed, but are deemed not persuasive for the reasons that follow. This action is made Non-FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

A. Claims 15-17, 23-26, 31-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowe et al. (WO 99/54510) in view of Wittwer et al. (USPN. 6,174,670).

Lowe et al. teach a method for determining a quantitative measure of an amplification of a target nucleic acid of claims 15-16, 23-26, 31-33, 38-39 comprising the steps of

(a) preparing a dilution series of the target nucleic acid (see page 3, line 12-14, page 6, line 20-28, page 11, line 24-35);

(b) amplifying the target nucleic acid under defined conditions and measuring the amplification in real-time (see page 3, line 14-25);

(c, d) setting a defined signal threshold value and determining for each dilution, the cycle number at which the signal threshold value is exceeded (threshold cycle for each dilution) (see page 3, line 25-27, page 10, line 16-23);

(f) calculating the amplification equivalent in each dilution series and normalizing the RNA equivalent to provide normalized RNA equivalent standard curve. (see page 3, line 29-33, page 10, lines 31-39).

With regard to claim 23, 25, Lowe et al. teach determining concentration of the target nucleic acid (see page 12, line 9-15);

With regard to claim 31-33, Lowe et al. teach quantifying the amount of target nucleic acid relative to the reference nucleic acid (see page 13, line 30-39, page 14, line 1-19);

With regard to claims 38- 39, Lowe et al teach a method for quantitation of a target nucleic acid using internal standard or reference nucleic acid (see page 13, line 10-39);

With regard to claims 34-35, 40-41, Lowe et al. teach said amplified nucleic acid is detected using fluorescently labeled probe such as TAQMAN probes or FRET probes (see page 10, line 1-30, page 8, line 29-36).

However, Lowe et al. did not teach determining a non-linear continuously differentiable function of a logarithm of copy number and detecting amplified nucleic acid using a DNA-binding dye, SYBR Green I.

Wittwer et al. teach a method of claims 15-17, 23-26, 31-41, for monitoring and quantitating target nucleic acid during real- PCR, wherein Wittwer et al. disclose that the method DNA monitoring at each PCR cycle by measuring melting curves and calculating copy number at each cycle utilizing DNA-binding dye (SYBR Green I), which represents a non-linear continuously differentiable function of logarithm of copy number that is represented as a polynomial fit of copy number of target nucleic acid at each PCR cycle (see col. 3, line 30-61, col. 4, line 45-63, col. 7, line 14-31, Fig. 22-23, Col. 17, line 34-39).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine a method of determining the efficiency of amplification and quantitating a target nucleic acid as taught by Lowe et al. in view of Wittwer et al. with the step of detecting amplified nucleic acid using SYBR Green I dye as taught by Wittwer et al. to achieve expected advantage of developing an improved sensitive method for quantitating a target nucleic acid because Wittwer et al. explicitly taught that the correlation between the threshold cycle and the initial concentration of DNA templates copy number provides precise measurement of abundance of target nucleic acids and its non-linear functionality (3-dimensional spiral) (see col. 4, line 45-63) and SYBR Green I is a preferred double-strand-specific dye for fluorescence monitoring of PCR, primarily because of superior sensitivity, arising from greater discrimination between double stranded and single stranded nucleic acid, and is inexpensive dye (see col. 4, line 45-63, column 23, line 9-16). An ordinary

Art Unit: 1637

practitioner would have been motivated to combine the method of determining the efficiency of an amplification of a target nucleic acid and quantitation of said nucleic acid as taught by Lowe et al. in view of Wittwer et al. with the inclusion of determining non-linear continuously differentiable function of logarithm of copy number using SYBR Green I dye as taught by Wittwer et al. for the purpose of enhancing the sensitivity of the method for quantitation of a target nucleic acid and for cost-effective purposes.

Response to arguments:

4. With regard to the rejection above, under 35 USC 103(a), Applicants' arguments are fully considered and found persuasive. The rejection is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

5. With regard to rejection above under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Lowe et al. in view of Zhang et al. further in view of Wittwer et al., Applicants arguments are fully considered and found persuasive. The rejection is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.


Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suryaprabha Chunduru whose telephone number is 571-272-0783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30A.M. - 4.30P.M , Mon - Friday,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Suryaprabha Chunduru
Examiner
Art Unit 1637


GARY BENZION, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600